



# State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF WATER RIGHTS

Michael O. Leavitt  
Governor

Kathleen Clarke  
Executive Director

Robert L. Morgan  
State Engineer

Southwestern Region  
585 North Main Street, Suite 1  
PO Box 506  
Cedar City, Utah 84721-0506  
435-586-4231  
435-586-2789 (Fax)

RECEIVED  
AUG 31 2000  
WATER RIGHTS  
SALT LAKE

4 August 2000

John Tullis  
1545 Old Piedmont Rd.  
SAN JOSE CA 95132

RE: WATER USER ON PINTO CREEK, WASHINGTON COUNTY, UTAH

Mr. Tullis:

Your letter dated 01 August 2000 has been received in this office. Although I cannot be certain from the information you have provided, it appears that the farm to which you refer is that presently owned by Ivan B. & Helen C. Cannon, successors to R. Warren Platt of New Castle.

The water rights associated with the farm are identified as Water Rights Numbered **71-107** and **71-419**. Both rights carry priority dates of 1890 and are based on pre-statutory or "diligence" claims filed in the general adjudication of the Escalante Valley. Said general adjudication was initiated upon petition to the State Engineer in 1940 and the State Engineer's Proposed Determination of Water Rights was published and distributed in five "books" during the 1960's. The subject rights appear at page 36 of the book entitled "Enterprise Area". Attached are photocopies of the relevant portions of the Proposed Determination (hereafter, "PD").

In response to your numbered inquiries:

- 1) We have no verified information regarding the acreage currently being irrigated under these rights. The acreage described in the PD was that found being irrigated during the 1950's/1960's. We are currently in the process of obtaining aerial photography of the area which will be used to determine irrigated acreage and to identify those water users who may be irrigating more acreage than allowed by their rights. Until this enforcement work is completed, we cannot speak to the issue of currently irrigated acreage.
- 2) As you will see from the PD, the two subject rights provide for the diversion of up to 1.0 cubic foot per second (cfs) of water during the irrigation period of March 15 through November 1. Because there are other water users on Pinto Creek with equal or earlier priority, there may be times when there is insufficient water for these rights to take their full flow allotment. However, there is not currently a Distribution Commissioner ("watermaster") who is monitoring or distributing the water of Pinto Creek. There has been a Commissioner in the past who has made intermittent "spot checks" on Pinto Creek as part of other duties, but there are minimal records of those activities. What records

LEE SIM

In the closing paragraphs of your letter, you repeat the allegations that the water user appears to be irrigating more acreage than the subject rights allow, to be using more water per acre than was historically used, and has unlawfully altered the natural course of the channel. You then request a reply as to my areas of responsibility in these matters.

been made, others would have been denied permits. Some such violations would have been permitted if proper applications had normally. In my mind that some violations have occurred that have not been detected nor dealt with issued and the work was ordered removed and the channel restored. There is little doubt advance, in others, "after-the-fact" permits were acquired. In yet others, permits were not portions of the Pinto Creek channel. In some cases, this work has been permitted in 20 years, performed work purportedly intended to prevent erosion and to upgrade incised It is understood that a number of landowners along Pinto Creek have, through the past 10-

3) On the basis of my current knowledge, I cannot confirm nor deny your allegations of illegal stream alteration activities. In 1988, Ivan Cannon filed for and was granted a permit to alter the channel of Pinto Creek (Permit No. 88-71-01SA). However, that permit was limited to the construction of a culverted road crossing and there were no engineered plans required.

Under Utah law, beneficial use constitutes the basis and the limit of a water right. In this case, the beneficial use limits are 14.60 acres of irrigation, 23 head of livestock and the domestic purposes of one family. Although this information has been informally presented to water users in various settings (e.g., annual Distribution Meetings), to my knowledge there have been no formal notices given nor penalties assessed to this water user.

Obviously, this is well in excess of the amount allowed, but we have no verified information to confirm that this quantity of water is being taken. It is also understood that alfalfa hay - and even less so, pasture - would not consume that much water and that a significant portion would return to the creek in the form of runoff or return flows. As set forth in the PD, these rights permit the diversion of up to 58.40 acre-feet for irrigation (14.60 acres @ 4 acre-feet per acre), plus an additional 14.60 acre-feet "for transmission purposes". An additional small amount is allowed for stockwatering and domestic purposes. Diversion at the rate of 1.0 cfs during the entire irrigation season (231 days) would result in a total of over 450 acre-feet of water being diverted.

are available have questionable validity because the readings were too intermittent to justify extrapolation.

Tullis  
3 August 2000  
Page 2

---

Our office has limited enforcement authority and functions primarily as an administrative agency. If we become aware of and can independently verify that activities of the type you allege are occurring, we will typically contact the party in violation and pursue the most effective remedies available. However, in many cases, those remedies are only available through the filing of actions in the District Court, a time-consuming and expensive process. For those reasons, we will generally only pursue court filings in the most serious cases and with the most recalcitrant violators.

Water users whose rights are impaired by the illegal activities of others are advised to provide this office with specific information documenting the manner in which their rights are being affected. We will then evaluate the situation to determine the most effective action. If such actions are not satisfactory to the complainant, or if the parties dispute the facts of the alleged violation and/or interference, our office does not have the authority to adjudicate those disputes and must refer the parties to other legal remedies (e.g., litigation, arbitration and stipulation, etc.).

As you may be aware, the battle over the waters of Pinto Creek goes back many years and is not likely to be resolved in the near future. We are hopeful that our current efforts to impose proper acreage limitations in the area – including the water users on Pinto Creek – will lead to some progress in that direction.

By copy of this letter, the Cannon's are being informed of your concerns. Hopefully, if there are violations occurring, they are the result of misunderstanding the limitations of the underlying rights and will be corrected promptly.

Sincerely,



Kerry Carpenter, P.E.  
Regional Engineer

pc: Files 71-107, 419  
Ivan B. & Helen C. Cannon / 3038 Losee Rd. / LAS VEGAS NV 89030  
Lee Sim, P.E. / Assistant State Engineer / Distribution

DETERMINATION OF WATER RIGHTS, ESCALANTE VALLEY  
IRON, WASHINGTON, AND BEAVER COUNTIES, UTAH

CLAIM NO.	NAME & ADDRESS OF CLAIMANT	SOURCE & TYPE OF RIGHT	PRIORITY DATE	FLOW C.F.S.	POINT OF DIVERSION		PERIOD OF USE, Inclusive	
					FROM	TO	FROM	TO
2377	United States of America Forest Service Ogden, Utah	Mineral Spring No. 2, Diligence Map 131	1860	.0134	Stock water directly on spring located in the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 5, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	May 21	Sept. 30	
858	United States of America Forest Service Ogden, Utah	Tank Spring Application No. 16285 Cert. of APP. No. 4269 Map 131-b	Jan. 19 1945	0 .0004	Stock water directly on spring located in the NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 6, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	May 21	Sept. 30	
1430	United States of America Forest Service Ogden, Utah	Wheatgrass Creek, Diligence Map 131	1860		Stock water directly on stream from point of stream's issuance in SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 8, T37S, R15W, SLB&M. to point of stream's confluence with Pinto Creek in NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec.15, T37S,R15W,SLB&M.	May 21	Sept. 30	
99	Fullis, David A. & Mary L. (Joint Tenants) Newcastle, Utah	Pinto Creek, Diligence Map 132-c	1870	2.0	N. 1180 ft. W. 2360 ft. from SE cor. Sec. 10, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	March 15	Nov. 1	
					Jan. 1	Dec. 31		
1427	United States of America Forest Service Ogden, Utah	Pinto Creek, Diligence Map 132-c	1860		Stock water directly on stream from point located S. 980 ft. E. 1180 ft. from NW cor. Sec.15, T37S, R15W, SLB&M. to point where stream leaves SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec.10, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	May 21	Sept. 30	
1429	United States of America Forest Service Ogden, Utah	Oak Spring, Diligence Map 131	1860	.0134	Stock water directly on spring located in the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 17, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	May 21	Sept. 30	
419	Platt, R. Warren Newcastle, Utah, as written <i>Platt, R. Warren Newcastle, Utah, as written</i>	Pinto Creek, Diligence Map 132-c	1890	0.25	N. 1075 ft. E. 195 ft. from SW cor. Sec. 15, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	March 15	Nov. 1	
107	Platt, R. Warren Newcastle, Utah Van B. & Helen C. Cannon Jr Las Vegas	Pinto Creek, Diligence Map 132-c	1890	0.75	N. 1075 ft. E. 195 ft. from SW cor. Sec. 15, T37S, R15W, SLB&M.	March 15	Nov. 1	
					March 15	Nov. 1		
					March 15	Nov. 1		

DETERMINATION OF WATER RIGHTS, ESCALANTE VALLEY  
IRON, WASHINGTON, AND BEAVER COUNTIES, UTAH

ANNUAL WATER ALLOWED	PURPOSE, EXTENT & PLACE OF USE	CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	REMARKS	CLAIM NO.
FARM HEADGATE AC. FT.	DIVERSION FROM SOURCE AC. FT.			
	See Remarks	STOCKWATERING: 678 cattle and horses - Pinto Allotment SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	For Claims Used for Purpose Described see Water User's Claim 856, Page 1.	2377
	See Remarks	STOCKWATERING: 678 cattle and horses - Pinto Allotment SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	For Claims Used for Purpose Described see Water User's Claim 856, Page 1.	858
99.48 See Remarks	A total of 24.87 ac. ft. is awarded for transmission purposes under W. U. Claim 99.	IRRIGATION: 9.60 acs. SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 10, T37N, R15W, SLB&M, 6.10 acs. NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 10.90 acs. SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 11, T37S, R15W, SEE CLAIM USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	For Claims Used for Purpose Described see Water User's Claim 856, Page 1.	1430
2.02		STOCKWATERING: 70 cattle, 2 horses SEE CLAIM USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	Water User's Claim 99 is limited to the irrigation requirements of 24.87 acres.	99
0.73		DOMESTIC: 1 family SEE CLAIM USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED		
	See Remarks	STOCKWATERING: 678 cattle and horses - Pinto Allotment SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	For Claims Used for Purpose Described see Water User's Claim 856, Page 1.	1427
	See Remarks	STOCKWATERING: 678 cattle and horses - Pinto Allotment SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	For Claims Used for Purpose Described see Water User's Claim 856, Page 1.	1429
	See Remarks	IRRIGATION: 0.50 ac. NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 12.60 ac. SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 7.40 ac. NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 15, T37S, R15W, SLB&M, or total acreage of 20.50 ac. SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	Diversion any, each, or all claims. Total yearly diversion under all claims mentioned 18.980 ac. ft.	419
	See Remarks	A total of 14.60 ac. ft. is awarded for transmission purposes under W. U. Claims 419 and 107.	Diversion any, each, or all claims. Total yearly diversion under all claims mentioned 18.980 ac. ft.	107
	See Remarks	IRRIGATION: 0.50 ac. NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 12.60 acs. SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , 7.40 acs. NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ Sec. 15, T37S, R15W, SLB&M, or total acreage of 20.50 ac. SEE CLAIMS USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	Water User's Claims 107 and 419 are limited to the irrigation requirements of 14.60 acres. Diversion any, each, or all claims. Total yearly diversion under all claims mentioned 58.40 ac. ft.	419
0.64		STOCKWATERING: 20 cattle, 3 horses SEE CLAIM USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	Flow for this purpose is part of flow for irrigation.	107
0.73		DOMESTIC: 1 family SEE CLAIM USED FOR PURPOSE DESCRIBED	Flow for this purpose is part of flow for irrigation.	107